1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
<ul><li>7</li><li>8</li><li>9</li></ul>	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10 11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CASE NO. CR12-5091RJB
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S RENEWED MOTION FOR
13 14	v. SKEETER TIMOTHY MANOS,	JUDICIAL RECOMMENDATIO OF CONCURRENT SENTENCE
15	Defendant.	
16	This matter comes before the court on the above-referenced motion (Dkt. 36). The court	
17	is familiar with the records and files herein and documents filed in support of and in opposition	
18	to the motion. For the following reasons, the motion should be denied.	
19	Regardless of the questionable legal authority to modify the court's judgment as set forth	
20	in the United States' Response to Defendant's Renewed Motion (Dkt. 37), it appears to the court	
21	that, on its merits, the motion should be denied.	
22	This court sentenced Mr. Manos to what the court believes is an appropriate sentence.	
23	He was then charged with separate state crimes and, in separate state proceedings, he was	
24	sentenced by a state judge. That judge declined to make his state sentence concurrent with the	

1	federal sentence. For the federal court to now provide that the defendant's state sentence should	
2	be served concurrently with the federal sentence would be to, in effect, reverse the state judge's	
3	decision. That is not called for and would be a bad practice. The state judge's decision should	
4	be given "full faith and credit" in this court.	
5	Furthermore, the federal and state prosecutions, though on the same subject matter, were	
6	for different crimes, and the sentences should not be served concurrently, unless the judge	
7	imposing the second sentence felt that the his sentence should run concurrent with the first	
8	sentence imposed.	
9	The information provided by the government regarding restitution is not something that	
10	the court should now consider in determining the issue at hand.	
11	Defendant's Renewed Motion for Judicial Recommendation of Concurrent Sentence	
12	should be, and hereby is, DENIED.	
13	The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to all counsel of record and	
14	to any party appearing <i>pro se</i> at said party's last known address.	
15	Dated this 17 <sup>th</sup> day of June, 2013.	
16	PIANT	
17	Kaker & Bryan	
18	ROBERT J. BRYAN United States District Judge	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		